

REMARKS

1. Introduction

In the final Office Action mailed January 30, 2009, the Examiner made the restriction requirement final. Thus, the Examiner examined claims 1-8 on the merits.

The results of the examination of claims 1-8 are as follows:

- The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lee et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,755,984 (“Lee”);
- The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaper, U.S. Patent No. 6,849,558 (“Schaper”);
- The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chou, U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0132482 (“Chou”); and
- The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou.

In response, Applicant has canceled claims 9-13, amended claim 1, and added new claim 27. Claims 14-26 were previously canceled. Thus, claims 1-8 and 27 are currently pending.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims, as amended herein, for the reasons set forth below.

2. Response to the claim rejections

Applicant has amended claim 1 to specify that the texturing is performed “after baking of the polymer layer at a temperature below the glass transition temperature.”

This amendment is supported by Applicant's specification, for example, at page 1, lines 21-29 and page 3, lines 1-14.

Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over Lee, Schaper, and Chou because none of these references appears to mention any such baking of the polymer layer. Although Chou discloses examples in which a layer of PMMA is heated, the PMMA is heated to a temperature that is *above* its glass transition temperature. See paragraphs [0028], [0047], and [0049]. In contrast, amended claim 1 recites that the baking of the polymer layer is at a temperature that is *below* the glass transition temperature.

Moreover, Applicant submits that heating *below* the glass transition temperature results in a different polymer layer than heating *above* the glass transition temperature. As described in Applicant's specification (page 3, lines 1-11), baking the single-phase polymer below its glass transition temperature (T_g) provides that a degree of instability remains in the polymer to form a firm but flexible film on top of the substrate. In contrast, if a baking temperature higher than the T_g of the polymer is employed, no instability remains in the polymer layer. Thus, the process step of "baking of the polymer layer at a temperature below the glass transition temperature of the polymer" results in a structure that is different than the structures allegedly disclosed in Lee, Schaper, and Chou.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over Lee, Schaper, and Chou. Applicant further submits that claims 2-8 and 27 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend upon an allowable claim.

3. **Conclusion**

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at any time at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 28, 2009

By: Richard A. Machonkin
Richard A. Machonkin
Registration No. 41,962